

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/691,645

Applicant(s)

MAURER ET AL.

Examiner

David L. Sorkin

Art Unit

1723

All Participants:

(1) David L. Sorkin.

(2) William Michael Hynes.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2 February 2004

Time: 12:30 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

not discussed

Claims discussed:

9-19, especially 11-13

Prior art documents discussed:

not discussed

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Hynes authorized an examiner's amendment canceling the non-elected claims and eliminating the requirement that the protrusion be "supported on" a "continuous entirely planar, circumferential joint surface", which the examiner contended was not sufficiently supported in the originally filed specification, particularly in combination with the other requirements of claim 13..